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## Introduction:

Routine health data in the Czech Republic are collected in the most detail on the level of 77 districts and unable itself for analysis of socioeconomic differences between districts. The socioeconomic factors might be one of the determinants of the differences in health indicators between the districts. The goal of the presented analysis was to identify the associations between available socioeconomic data and health indicators.

## Methods:

The total SMR, SMR for all cancers, breast cancer in women, lung cancer in men; cardiovascular, respiratory and gastrointestinal tract diseases; and incidence of all cancers and diabetes mellitus were analyzed by weighted average educational level of each district, the composition of households (proportion of complete and incomplete families or individuals living alone) and density of housing, average income, total unemployment rate and number of physicians per 1,000 inhabitants. The health indicators were based on routinely collected data 2001), the socioeconomic characteristics of districts were based on 2001 Census data. The weighted educational level by and women. The index of education was based on 5-degrees scale - basic (1), education was based on higher and university degree (5). As the educational higner and unive districts (Prague, Brno and PIzen) was evel of 3 of the districts (Prague, Brno and Pizen) was outlier (higher proportion of university degree education districts were dropped from the final analysis. The linear districts were dropped from the final analysis. The linear regression was used for the analysis. The GIS (Geographical Information System) was used for visualization of the presented results (Fig. 1 and 2)


## Results:









 and 4.

Table 1 Correlations between SMR/ incidence and SES factors in men

| Men | Mortality |  |  |  |  |  |  | Incidence |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { cancers } \end{gathered}$ | Lung cancers | Respir. diseases | CVD | Gastroint. diseases | Injuries | All cancers | Diabetes |
| Education | -0.56 | -0.50 | -0.60 | -0.15 | -0.36 | -0.22 | -0.23 | -0.24 | -0.04 |
| Incomplete families | 0.34 | 0.35 | 0.38 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.34 | 0.19 | -0.06 | -0.03 |
| Singles | 0.40 | 0.39 | 0.50 | 0.24 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 0.22 | 0.10 | 0.22 |
| Complete families | -0.43 | -0.45 | -0.57 | -0.24 | -0.10 | -0.19 | -0.25 | -0.17 | -0.17 |
| Density of housing | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.15 | -0.12 | 0.07 | 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.31 | 0.09 |
| Average income | -0.01 | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.17 | -0.06 | -0.01 | -0.10 | -0.22 | 0.05 |
| Unemployment rate | 0.62 | 0.44 | 0.31 | -0.02 | 0.53 | 0.49 | 0.18 | 0.44 | 0.18 |
| $\mathbf{N r}$, of physicians/ per 1,000 | -0.13 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.09 | -0.25 | -0.01 | -0.03 | 0.18 | 0.33 |

Table 2 Correlations between SMR/incidence and SES factors in women

| Women | Mortality |  |  |  |  |  |  | Incidence |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { All } \\ \text { cancers } \end{gathered}$ | Breast cancers | Respir. diseases | CVD | Gastroint. diseases | Injuries | All cancers | Diabetes |
| Education | -0.38 | -0.21 | 0.02 | -0.07 | -0.24 | -0.23 | -0.09 | -0.33 | -0.07 |
| I ncomplete families | 0.26 | 0.39 | 0.19 | 0.15 | -0.02 | 0.15 | 0.05 | 0.07 | -0.03 |
| Singles | 0.62 | 0.60 | 0.47 | 0.24 | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.15 | 0.21 | 0.17 |
| Complete families | -0.57 | -0.62 | -0.41 | -0.28 | -0.09 | -0.24 | -0.12 | -0.28 | -0.14 |
| Density of housing | -0.02 | 0.08 | -0.07 | -0.08 | -0.11 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.26 | 0.1 |
| Average income | 0.13 | 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.07 | 0.07 | -0.08 | -0.10 | -0.09 | -0.01 |
| Unemployment rate | 0.40 | 0.15 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.34 | 0.44 | -0.10 | 0.16 | 0.2 |
| Nr. of physicians/ per 1,000 | -0.16 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.09 | -0.31 | 0.04 | -0.08 | 0.04 | 0.30 |



Fig. 3 Correlations between health indicators and SES factors in men


Fig. 4 Correlations between health indicators and SES factors in women


## Discussion:






 not consistent. This fact might be explained by still persisted equalitarianism of income.

## Conclusions:

In the Czech Republic there exist social health inequalities between - men and women - groups by attained education level - groups by marital status (singles versus complete families) - districts with the different unemployment rate

Health indicators are significantly correlated with - education (more in men) - total SMR, all and lung cancers SMR - family status (more in women) - total SMR, all and breast cancers SMR - unemployment rate (more in men) - total and all cancers SMR, CVD and gastrointestinal SMR and incidence of cancers

Density of housing, average income and access to health care (Nr. of physicians per 1,000 inhabitants) did not show any consistent association with the health outcomes. The socio-economic health inequalities need to be investigated in further research that will bring explanation of the presented differences.

